

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Raymond A. Parson,

Case No. 12-cv-0646 (DWF/DJF)

Plaintiff,

v.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Lori Swanson, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Raymond A. Parson is a client of the Minnesota Sex Offender Program (“MSOP”). On September 13, 2022, he filed a 146-page, 32-count complaint (“Complaint”) (ECF No. 1). He simultaneously filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) and preliminary injunction requesting that MSOP officials be stopped from implementing several policies he alleged to be unlawful (“Motion”) (ECF No. 4). The Court subsequently stayed this matter pending the resolution of another MSOP case, *Karsjens v. Minnesota Department of Human Services*, No. 11-cv-3659 (DWF/TNL). (ECF No. 7.) The Court lifted the stay on October 3, 2022. (ECF No. 19).

On October 7, 2022, the Court ordered Mr. Parson to file an amended complaint that complied with Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, failing which the Court would recommend this matter be dismissed without prejudice. (ECF No. 20.) Mr. Parson timely filed an amended complaint on November 2, 2022 (“Amended Complaint”) (ECF No. 21) consisting of just two pages and two claims for relief, neither of which he raised in his original Complaint, and which do not relate to the remedies he seeks in his Motion. (*Compare* ECF No. 1 *with* ECF No. 21.)

“[A] party moving for a preliminary injunction must necessarily establish a relationship between the injury claimed in the party’s motion and the conduct asserted in the complaint.” *Devose v. Herrington*, 42 F.3d 470, 471 (8th Cir. 1994) (per curiam). While his Amended Complaint is not entirely clear, it appears that Mr. Parson claims that he was denied due process of law during the *Karsjens* litigation and that a doctor employed at the MSOP was deliberately indifferent to his medical needs nearly a decade ago. These claims are not conducive to injunctive relief. Accordingly, the Court recommends that his Motion be denied.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff Raymond A. Parson’s motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction (ECF No. [4]) be **DENIED**.

Dated: November 21, 2022

s/ Dulce J. Foster

 DULCE J. FOSTER
 United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE

Filing Objections: This Report and Recommendation is not an order or judgment of the District Court and is therefore not appealable directly to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under Local Rule 72.2(b)(1), “a party may file and serve specific written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed finding and recommendations within 14 days after being served a copy” of the Report and Recommendation. A party may respond to those objections within 14 days after being served a copy of the objections. *See* Local Rule 72.2(b)(2). All objections and responses must comply with the word or line limits set forth in Local Rule 72.2(c).